UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,258	12/03/2003	Nisheth P. Joshi	M61.12-0563	4660

27366   7590   12/14/2006

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/727,258	JOSHI ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Cam Y T. Truong	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 September 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-34 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3   Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "which" is

recited in claim 20. This term is unclear whether "which" means the source system or

the intermediate database system. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 8, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa

(US 6915304

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a

source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

"examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system" as the

XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object,

Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The

above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is

examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the

source data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data

includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the

extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over

a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

"collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2,

lines 1-5)

Earshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "synchronizing a

structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system".

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure.

It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data

model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the

tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single

query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual

components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do

not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing

between a relational database with an XML data structure to Varshavsky's system in

order to improve searching/retrieving a large amount of a database on Internet quickly.

As to claim 2, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "accessing metadata

related to the extensible destination system" as (col. 1, lines 35-50).

As to claim 3, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein synchronizing

the structure of the intermediate database system with the extensible destination

system includes invoking an initialization tool" as an XML converter 116 maps the set

of relational data to an XML document 104 using the set of XML Mapping definitions

constructed for a particular application. The XM converter is represented as an

initialization tool (col. 4, lines 65-67).

As to claims 4 and 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

intermediate database system includes an entity base table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claims 5 and 22 , Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

intermediate database system includes an entity information table" as (col. 6, lines 55-

67).

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches claimed limitations:

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

"collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the structure of which is synchronized with the destination system".

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure. It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing between a relational database with an XML data structure to Varshavsky's system in order to improve searching/retrieving a large amount of a database on Internet quickly.

As to claim 8, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system is done according to migration overhead information" as (col. 5, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 40-57).

6.   Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claims 6 and 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation "the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table". Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to apply Nelson's teaching of extension table to varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

7.   Claims 7, 9 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claims 7 and 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as

described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

As to claims 9 and 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the migration overhead information is user-configurable".

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

8.   Claims 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and

further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497) and Amborse (US

20020065879) .

As to claims 10 and 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined

software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules

(paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is

limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly

reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

9.   Claims 11-18, 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and

further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claims 11 and 27, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which

entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes

information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 12 and 28, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how may entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 13 and 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 14 and 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 15 and 31 Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data

transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exorting of data

in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 16 and 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration

for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer

files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred

(col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data

transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of

data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 17 and 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein

migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-

55).

As to claims 18 and 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col.

6, lines 55-67).

10.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and

further in view of Macleod et al (or hereinafter "Macleod") (US 6356901).

As to claim 19, Varshavsky doses not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL

server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Varshavsky's

system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily.

11.   Claims 1-5, 8, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Mullins et

al (or hereinafter "Mullins") (US 20040123048).

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a

source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

"examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system" as the

XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object,

Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The

above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is

examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the source

data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an

employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the

extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over

a network (col. 2, lines 40-45);

"collecting source data from the source system" (col. 1, lines 57-65; col. 2, lines

1-5);

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "synchronizing

a structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system"

Mullins teaches synchronizing both a relational database structure and an object

model (paragraph [0007]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Mullins's teaching of synchronizing both a relational

database structure and an object model to Varshavsky's system in order to order to

improve searching/retrieving a large amount of a database on Internet quickly.

As to claim 2, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "accessing metadata

related to the extensible destination system" as (col. 1, lines 35-50).

As to claim 3, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein synchronizing

the structure of the intermediate database system with the extensible destination

system includes invoking an initialization tool" as an XML converter 116 maps the set

of relational data to an XML document 104 using the set of XML Mapping definitions

constructed for a particular application. The XM converter is represented as an

initialization tool (col. 4, lines 65-67).

As to claims 4 and 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

intermediate database system includes an entity base table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claims 5 and 22, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

intermediate database system includes an entity information table" as (col. 6, lines 55-

67).

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitations:

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data" as

storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee

or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible

destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network

(col. 2, lines 40-45).

collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2,

lines 1-5).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the structure of which is synchronized with the destination system".

Mullins teaches synchronizing both a relational database structure and an object model (paragraph [0007]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mullins's teaching of synchronizing both a relational database structure and an object model to Varshavsky's system in order to order to improve searching/retrieving/imagrating a large amount of a database on Internet quickly from one system to another system.

As to claim 8, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system is done according to migration overhead information" as (col. 5, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 40-57).

12.   Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Mullins further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claims 6 and 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation "the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table". Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention as made to apply Nelson's teaching of extension table to varshavsky's

system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

13.   Claims 7, 9 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in

view of Mullins and further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claims 9 and 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation

"the migration overhead information is user-configurable".

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is

represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in

order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following

user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

As to claims 7 and 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation

"the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible

destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described

herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When

the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the

particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

14.   Claims 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Mullins and further in view of Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497) and Amborse (US 20020065879).

As to claims 10 and 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is

limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly

reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

15.   Claims 11-18, 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Mullins

and further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claims 11 and 27, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which

entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes

information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data

transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred

to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML

system correctly.

As to claims 12 and 28, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how may

entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files.

The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines

1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 13 and 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 14 and 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 15 and 31, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exorting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 16 and 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claims 17 and 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claims 18 and 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

16.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Mullins and further in view of Macleod et al (or hereinafter "Macleod") (US 6356901).

As to claim 19, Varshavsky doses not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Varshavsky's system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily.

Contact Information

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162